

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MEGAN GOODEILL, on behalf of Minor
A.M.F.,

Plaintiff,

v.
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:21-cv-00242-CDB (SS)

ORDER (1) GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, (2)
DENYING DEFENDANT'S CROSS-
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT,
AND (3) REMANDING ACTION FOR
FURTHER PROCEEDINGS UNDER
SENTENCE FOUR OF 42 U.S.C. § 405(g)

(Docs. 27, 31)

Megan Goodeill on behalf of her minor daughter A.M.F. ("Plaintiff") seeks judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security ("Commissioner" or "Defendant") denying Plaintiff's application for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits under the Social Security Act. (Doc. 4). The matter is before the Court on the certified administrative record (Doc. 18) and the parties' briefs, which were submitted without oral argument. (Docs. 27, 31).¹ Plaintiff asserts the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") failed to properly analyze non-medical opinions and erred in concluding A.M.F. is less than markedly impaired in the domain of attending and completing tasks. (Doc. 27 at 2, 8-12). Plaintiff requests the decision of the Commissioner be vacated and the case be remanded for

¹ Both parties have consented to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge for all proceedings in this action, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1). (Doc. 15).

1 further proceedings including a *de novo* hearing and new decision. *Id.* at 11.

2

I. BACKGROUND²

3 In February 2017, an application for supplemental security income was protectively filed
4 on behalf of Plaintiff, who was six years old at the time, alleging a period of disability beginning
5 on August 20, 2016. (Administrative Record (“AR”) 91, 191). Plaintiff claimed disability due to
6 issues with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (“ADHD”), schizophrenia, sensory processing
7 disorder, and “hearing ear.” *Id.* at 91. The Commissioner denied Plaintiff’s application initially
8 and again on reconsideration. *Id.* at 91-116, 118-22, 127-31. Plaintiff submitted a written request
9 for a hearing by an ALJ. *Id.* at 135-49. On May 22, 2019, Plaintiff, represented by counsel,
10 appeared in person for a hearing before ALJ Shiva Bozarth. *Id.* at 39-90. Additionally, Faren
11 Ray Akins, Ph.D., appeared as a medical expert, and Megan Goodeill appeared as a witness. *Id.*
12 at 46-77, 176-77. On September 30, 2020, the ALJ issued a decision finding that Plaintiff was
13 not disabled. *Id.* at 18-33.

14 On June 8, 2020, the Appeals Council denied Plaintiff’s request for review, making the
15 ALJ’s decision the final decision of the Commissioner. *Id.* at 4-9. Plaintiff filed this action on
16 February 22, 2021, seeking judicial review of the denial of his application for benefits and a
17 motion to appoint Megan Goodeill as guardian *ad litem*. (Docs. 1-2). The following day,
18 Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint and an amended motion to appoint Megan Goodeill as
19 guardian *ad litem*. (Docs. 4, 6). The Commissioner lodged the administrative record on February
20 25, 2022. (Doc. 18). Plaintiff filed an opening brief on July 7, 2022. (Doc. 27). On October 5,
21 2022, Defendant filed a responsive brief. (Doc. 31).

22

II. THE DISABILITY STANDARD

23 An individual under the age of eighteen will be deemed disabled if she has “a medically
24 determinable physical or mental impairment or combination of impairments that causes marked
25 and severe functional limitations, and that can be expected to cause death or that has lasted or can
26 be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.” 20 C.F.R. § 416.906.

27

28 ² The relevant hearing testimony and medical record were reviewed by the Court and will
be referenced in the opinion as necessary to this Court’s decision.

1 The Social Security regulations provide a three-step process in determining whether a child is
2 disabled. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 416.924. First, the ALJ must determine whether the child is engaged in
3 substantial gainful activity. 20 C.F.R. § 416.924(a). If the child is not engaged in substantial
4 gainful activity, then the analysis proceeds to step two, which requires the ALJ to determine
5 whether the child's impairment or combination of impairments is severe. *Id.* The child will not
6 be found to have a severe impairment if it constitutes a "slight abnormality or combination of
7 slight abnormalities that causes no more than minimal functional limitations." 20 C.F.R. §
8 416.924(c). However, if there is a finding of severe impairment, the analysis proceeds to the final
9 step. Step three requires the ALJ to determine whether the impairment or combination of
10 impairments "meets, medically equals or functionally equals" the severity of a set of criteria for
11 an impairment in the Listing of Impairments. 20 C.F.R. § 416.924(d).

12 If an impairment does not meet the requirements of, or is not medically equal to, a listed
13 impairment, the claimant may still be disabled if his impairment or combination of impairments is
14 found to be "functionally equivalent" to a listed impairment. In child disability cases, a "whole
15 child approach" is used to determine functional equivalence. *R.S. by & Through Herrera v.*
16 *Berryhill*, 357 F. Supp. 3d 1033, 1037 (C.D. Cal. 2019). That is, the ALJ considers all of the
17 child's activities, "everything [the child does] at home, at school, and in [the] community." 20
18 C.F.R. § 416.926a(b). Functional equivalence is measured by assessing the claimant's ability to
19 function in the following six domains, which are "broad areas of functioning intended to capture
20 all of what a child can or cannot do": (i) acquiring and using information; (ii) attending and
21 completing tasks; (iii) interacting and relating with others; (iv) moving about and manipulating
22 objects; (v) caring for yourself; and (vi) health and physical well-being. 20 C.F.R. §§
23 416.926a(b)(1)(i)-(vi). Limitations in functioning must result from the child's medically
24 determinable impairments. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 416.924a (describing considerations for determining
25 disability for children). An impairment or combination of impairments is functionally equivalent
26 to a listing if it results in "marked" limitations in two areas, or an "extreme" limitation in one area
27 of functioning. 20 C.F.R. § 416.926a(a). Specifically:

1
2 We will find that you have a “marked” limitation in a domain when your impairment(s)
3 interferes seriously with your ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete
4 activities. Your day-to-day functioning may be seriously limited when your
5 impairment(s) limits only one activity or when the interactive and cumulative effects of
6 your impairment(s) limit several activities. “Marked” limitation also means a limitation
7 that is “more than moderate” but “less than extreme.” It is the equivalent of the
8 functioning we would expect to find on standardized testing with scores that are at least
9 two, but less than three, standard deviations below the mean.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 20 C.F.R. § 416.926a(e)(2)(i). A child of any age will be found to “have a ‘marked’ limitation
when [they] have a valid score that is two standard deviations or more below the mean, but less
than three standard deviations, on a comprehensive standardized test designed to measure ability
or functioning in that domain, and [their] day-to-day functioning in domain-related activities is
consistent with that score.” 20 C.F.R. § 416.926a(e)(2)(iii). Standardized testing provides
important information about deficits in development and functioning in terms of standard
deviations and percentiles. 20 C.F.R. § 416.926a(e)(1)(ii), (e)(2)(iii). However, test scores alone
do not establish marked or extreme limitations in a domain. 20 C.F.R. §§ 416.924a(a)(1)(ii), 20
C.F.R. § 416.926a(e)(4). No single piece of information taken in isolation can establish whether
the child has a “marked” limitation in a domain. 20 C.F.R. § 416.926a(e)(4)(i).

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865

1 1998).³

2 Here, Plaintiff contends that the ALJ erred in finding that she was not markedly limited in
 3 attending and completing tasks. (Doc. 27 at 2, 8-11). The domain of attending and completing
 4 tasks considers how well the child is able to focus and maintain attention, how well he begins,
 5 carries through, and finishes activities, including the pace at which activities are performed and
 6 the ease with which the child changes them. 20 C.F.R. § 416.926a(h)(1)(i). Claimants may be
 7 limited in attending and completing tasks if they are (1) easily startled, distracted, or overreactive
 8 to sounds, sights movements, or touch; (2) slow to focus on, or fail to complete activities of
 9 interest; (3) repeatedly sidetracked from activities or frequently interrupt others; (4) easily
 10 frustrated and give up on tasks, including ones they are capable of completing; and (5) require
 11 extra supervision to stay engaged in an activity. *Id.*; § 416.926a(h)(3)(i)-(v). The regulations
 12 summarize the typical functioning of school-age children with regard to this domain as follows:

13 When you are of school age, you should be able to focus your attention in a variety of
 14 situations in order to follow directions, remember and organize your school materials, and
 15 complete classroom and homework assignments. You should be able to concentrate on
 16 details and not make careless mistakes in your work (beyond what would be expected in
 17 other children your age who do not have impairments). You should be able to change
 18 your activities or routines without distracting yourself or others[] and stay on task and in
 19 place when appropriate. You should be able to sustain your attention well enough to
 20 participate in group sports, read by yourself, and complete family chores. You should also
 21 be able to complete a transition task (e.g., be ready for the school bus, change clothes after
 22 gym, change classrooms) without extra reminders and accommodation.

23 20 C.F.R. § 416.926a(h)(2)(iv). In making a determination of disability, “the ALJ must consider
 24 the ‘combined effect’ of all the claimant’s impairments without regard to whether any such
 25 impairment, if considered separately, would be of sufficient severity.” *Howard ex rel. Wolff v.*
Barnhart, 341 F.3d 1006, 1012 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting 20 C.F.R. § 416.923). “However, in
 26 interpreting the evidence and developing the record, the ALJ does not need to ‘discuss every
 27 piece of evidence.’” *Id.* (citing *Black v. Apfel*, 143 F.3d 383, 386 (8th Cir. 1998), and *Vincent v.*
Heckler, 739 F.2d 1393, 1394-95 (9th Cir. 1984)).

28

³ Available at https://www.ssa.gov/OP_Home/rulings/ssi/02/SSR98-01-ssi-02.html (last visited Dec. 29, 2023).

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

2 Congress has provided that an individual may obtain judicial review of any final decision
3 of the Commissioner of Social Security regarding entitlement to benefits. 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). In
4 determining whether to reverse an ALJ’s decision, a court reviews only those issues raised by the
5 party challenging the decision. *See Lewis v. Apfel*, 236 F.3d 503, 517 n.13 (9th Cir. 2001). A
6 court may set aside the Commissioner’s denial of benefits when the ALJ’s findings are based on
7 legal error or are not supported by substantial evidence. *Tackett v. Apfel*, 180 F.3d 1094, 1097
8 (9th Cir. 1999).

9 “Substantial evidence is relevant evidence which, considering the record as a whole, a
10 reasonable person might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” *Thomas v. Barnhart*, 278
11 F.3d 947, 954 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Flaten v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 44 F.3d 1453,
12 1457 (9th Cir. 1995)). “[T]he threshold for such evidentiary sufficiency is not high.” *Biestek v.*
13 *Berryhill*, 139 S. Ct. 1148, 1154 (2019). Rather, “[s]ubstantial evidence means more than a
14 scintilla, but less than a preponderance; it is an extremely deferential standard.” *Thomas v.*
15 *CalPortland Co.*, 993 F.3d 1204, 1208 (9th Cir. 2021) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

16 “[A] reviewing court must consider the entire record as a whole and may not affirm
17 simply by isolating a specific quantum of supporting evidence.” *Hill v. Astrue*, 698 F.3d 1153,
18 1159 (9th Cir. 2012) (internal quotations and citations omitted). “If the evidence ‘is susceptible
19 to more than one rational interpretation, it is the ALJ’s conclusion that must be upheld.’” *Ford*,
20 950 F.3d at 1154 (quoting *Burch v. Barnhart*, 400 F.3d 676, 679 (9th Cir. 2005)). Even if the
21 ALJ has erred, the Court may not reverse the ALJ’s decision where the error is harmless. *Stout v.*
22 *Comm’r. Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 454 F.3d 1050, 1055-56 (9th Cir. 2006). An error is harmless where it
23 is “inconsequential to the [ALJ’s] ultimate nondisability determinations.” *Tommasetti v. Astrue*,
24 533 F.3d 1035, 1038 (9th Cir. 2008) (quotation and citation omitted). The burden of showing that
25 an error is not harmless “normally falls upon the party attacking the agency’s determination.”
26 *Shinseki v. Sanders*, 556 U.S. 396, 409 (2009).

IV. THE ALI'S DECISION

28 On September 30, 2020, the ALJ issued a decision finding that Plaintiff was not disabled.

1 AR. 18-33. The ALJ conducted the three-step disability analysis set forth under 20 C.F.R. §
2 416.924(a) for claimants under the age of eighteen. *Id.* at 19-33. The ALJ found Plaintiff was a
3 school-age child (20 C.F.R. § 416.926a(g)(2)), and had not engaged in substantial activity since
4 February 2, 2017, the application date (step one). *Id.* at 21. The ALJ held Plaintiff possessed the
5 following severe impairments: selective immunoglobulin g deficiency, ADHD, and conductive
6 hearing loss of the right ear (step two). *Id.*

7 Next, the ALJ determined Plaintiff did not have an impairment or combination of
8 impairments that meets or medically equals the severity of one of the listed impairments in 20
9 C.F.R. Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1 (“the Listings”) (step three). *Id.* at 22. The ALJ noted
10 audiology testing did not indicate listing level hearing loss and the most recent testing indicated
11 greatly improved hearing in the right ear and mild conductive hearing loss in the left ear. *Id.* In
12 regard to Listing 112.11 (neurodevelopmental disorders), the ALJ found that “although [Plaintiff]
13 does present with distractibility and hyperactive behavior, she does not exhibit an extreme limit in
14 one area or marked limits in two areas of mental functioning set out in the listing.” *Id.*

15 The ALJ determined that Plaintiff does not have an impairment or combination of
16 impairments that functionally equals the severity of the Listings. *Id.* (citing 20 C.F.R. §
17 416.924(d) and 416.926a)). In reaching this functional equivalence determination, the ALJ
18 applied the “whole child” standard. *Id.* First, the ALJ considered testimony from Plaintiff’s
19 mother, Megan Goodeill. *Id.* at 23. Ms. Goodeill stated Plaintiff is chronically ill and misses a
20 lot of school. *Id.* Ms. Goodeill stated Plaintiff is unable to participate in physical education and
21 was removed from the cheer team because of a combination of physical issues and behavioral
22 issues. *Id.* Further, Ms. Goodeill testified:

23 “that [Plaintiff] has trouble with concentration and she is on the highest dosage of ADHD
24 medication. Despite medication, she requires redirection and timeouts in class. She also
25 has a sensory station in class when necessary. She goes to this area two to three times a
26 day. She said the claimant has been doing better with reading, but she is way behind in
27 math. She testified that the teacher said the claimant is always distracted and her hearing
28 Impairment increases her issues with learning. At home, she refuses or is unable to dress
herself or bathe herself. She drinks from a sippy cup, and she is bullied at school. Side
effects from medication include difficulty getting to sleep and weight loss. Completing

1 homework is a [four-hour] process because she needs redirection for each problem even
2 though she gets less work than the other students. The claimant has chronic sensory
3 issues and she sees someone that tells her to harm her sister. The claimant's mother said
the claimant has attacked her sister with a bat."

4 *Id.* Next, the ALJ considered the testimony of Plaintiff. *Id.* The ALJ found:

5 "The [Plaintiff] was able to testify appropriately and answered questions about her
6 interests. She was attentive and behaved in an age appropriate fashion during the hearing.
7 She said she does not like her sister, but she denied attacking her sister with a bat. She
8 said her sister pulls her hair. She testified that she is not good at math, but she likes to
9 read. She said she cared for her puppy[,] and she liked to clean, but her mom did not give
her chores. The claimant said she has a hard time sitting still in class and her teacher asks
her to settle down. She talks when she is not supposed to every day. She said she doesn't
10 always feel well in the mornings. She gets a stomach ache and her feet hurt."

11 *Id.* The ALJ determined that Plaintiff's medically determinable impairments could reasonably be
12 expected to produce the alleged symptoms. *Id.* However, the ALJ found the statements
13 concerning the intensity, persistence and limiting effects of those symptoms were not entirely
14 consistent with the medical evidence and other evidence in the record. *Id.* The ALJ noted
15 "although [Plaintiff] clearly has issues with attention," she has been progressing in school with
16 classroom accommodations and does not qualify for special education. *Id.* at 24. The ALJ found
17 "there does not appear to be abnormally frequent doctor visits for illness or problems caused by
18 absences at school" and there was some indication of noncompliance with treatment. *Id.* Instead,
19 the ALJ determined Plaintiff is able to behave during activities she enjoys. The ALJ noted Ms.
20 Goodeill's report that Plaintiff was not able to do physical education was not supported by the
21 school records or Plaintiff's pediatrician report. *Id.*

22 The ALJ reviewed Plaintiff's treatment records regarding her behavioral problems
23 beginning in 2016. *Id.* The ALJ noted Plaintiff exhibited difficulty with focus, hyperactivity,
24 tantrums, aggressiveness to peers, and heard commanding voices. *Id.* Plaintiff was prescribed
25 Adderall to treat her symptoms but was not always getting her afternoon dose "because she would
26 fight her mother over taking it." *Id.* Ms. Goodeill reported Plaintiff had social anxiety, had no
27 learning desire, did not like school, and did not want to leave the home. *Id.* Ms. Goodeill stated
28 she was called to pick up Plaintiff from kindergarten in the first five weeks of school, and that she

1 was taking out her rage on her older sister in March 2017. *Id.* In September 2017, Plaintiff was
2 doing well with her anger and self-control, had not been violent, and was reading better. *Id.* In
3 November 2017, Plaintiff was still having some disruptive behavior and fidgeting, but she was
4 learning yoga and was able to display focus. *Id.* The ALJ noted from January 2018 through
5 November 2018, Plaintiff was doing well in school with some setbacks. *Id.* at 24-25.

6 The ALJ also considered Plaintiff's school records. *Id.* at 25. The ALJ found Plaintiff's
7 school records did not indicate she was eligible for special education, but she did have a 504 plan
8 in place allowing classroom accommodations. *Id.* Plaintiff was allowed to use sensory toys and a
9 wiggle seat or other devices to aid in movement during instruction. *Id.* Plaintiff was seated close
10 to the teacher, was provided breaks when needed, and given "verbal reminders prior to activating
11 class behavior systems." *Id.* Plaintiff ended the 2017-2018 academic year at grade level in most
12 areas but needed improvement in listening attentively and staying on task. *Id.* The ALJ noted the
13 school records indicated Plaintiff is bright and articulate, was very social with peers, enjoyed
14 recess, progressed well, was not academically at risk, and her medication helped a lot. *Id.* The
15 records also reflected Plaintiff is of average intellectual ability and that she can be defiant and
16 uncooperative. *Id.*

17 The ALJ reviewed teacher questionnaires completed by Plaintiff's teachers. *Id.* Yazmin
18 Zavala, Plaintiff's kindergarten teacher, completed a questionnaire in March 2016. *Id.* The ALJ
19 noted:

20 "[Ms. Zavala] indicated the claimant was slightly below in reading and math and was at
21 grade level in written language (Exhibit 3F, p. 4). She indicated slight to no problems in
22 acquiring and using information, noting that her behavior had changed since the
23 beginning of the year. She was able to do all tasks in class, but put herself down or
24 did not listen to directions and she had trouble organizing her thoughts to write because
25 she was so verbal (Exhibit 3F, p. 5). She was able to write simple sentences independently
26 (Exhibit 3F, p. 5). Ms. Zavala indicated some obvious problems with attending and
27 completing tasks with a serious problem in working without distracting [herself] or others
28 (Exhibit 3F, p. 6). She specifically noted that the claimant tended to ask for help as soon
as she was asked to work independently, she was able to work independently once given
directions, she could correct mistakes in math and writing once they were pointed out, and
she tended to talk to herself or others and became a distraction unless her attention was
redirected (Exhibit 3F, p. 6). She noted mostly no to slight problems in interacting and
relating with others, but she stated there was an obvious problem in playing

[cooperatively] with other children, following rules, and taking turns in conversation, and a very serious problem with respecting/obeying adults in authority (Exhibit 3F, p. 7). The claimant had a modified behavioral plan and often did not believe she was at fault for her actions (Exhibit 3F, p. 7). There were no problems in moving about and manipulating objects (Exhibit 3F, p. 8). In caring for herself, Ms. Zavala noted mostly no to slight problems, but there was an obvious problem in responding appropriately to changes in her own mood and knowing when to ask for help (Exhibit 3F, p. 9). She noted the claimant had learned to control her emotions and reactions more appropriately, but continued to pout and stomp when something did not go her way (Exhibit 3F, p. 9). She did not indicate any medication problems, medications, or frequent absences (Exhibit 3F, p. 10)."

Id. Debra Heath, Plaintiff's first-grade teacher, completed a questionnaire in September 2017.

Id. at 26. The ALJ found:

"[Ms. Heath] indicated a slight problem in comprehending and doing math problems in the area of acquiring and using information, and she noted the claimant wore a microphone to assist her in hearing and she used fidget toys if needed (Exhibit 10F, p. 2). She reported only a slight problem paying attention when spoken to directly in the area of attending and completing tasks (Exhibit 10F, p. 3). The claimant had hearing support, sat closely to instruction, and she had not requested breaks of sensory toys more than three times in two months (Exhibit 10F, p. 3). There were no problems in interacting and relating with others, moving about and manipulating objects, or caring for herself (Exhibit 10F, pp. 4, 5, 6)."

Id. Lori Phillips, Plaintiff's second-grade teacher, completed a questionnaire in March 2019. *Id.*

The ALJ determined:

"[Ms. Phillips] reported no problems in acquiring and using information, interacting and relating with others, and caring for self (Exhibit 12E, pp. 2, 4, 6). In attending and completing tasks, she opined obvious problems in paying attention when spoken to directly, changing from one activity to another without being disruptive, and working at reasonable pace/finishing on time; serious problems in focusing long enough to finish [an] assigned activity or task, refocusing to task when necessary, organizing her own things or school materials, and completing work accurately without careless mistakes; and a very serious problem in working without distracting self or others (Exhibit 12E, p. 3). In a narrative, Ms. Phillips reported that frequently the claimant could not attend to tasks even on medication and she was all over the room bothering others despite redirection (Exhibit 12E, p. 3). With regard to moving about and manipulating objects, Ms. Phillips reported the claimant was moving much of the time and liked to mess around with items from the table or backpack (Exhibit 12E, p. 5). She also indicated the claimant was significantly better at focusing and staying on [task] with medication (Exhibit 12E, p. 7). She noted the claimant's hearing required her to wear a microphone and to sit near the speaker and even with her medication, there were days that it was very difficult for her to focus (Exhibit 12E, p. 8). However, she got along with others, and there was no limitation in caring for

1 herself (Exhibit 12E, pp. 6, 8). When she has not taken her medication, which was rare,
 2 she was out of her seat constantly, disrupting others and causing chaos, but her mother
 3 was supportive and on top of things (Exhibit 12E, p. 8).”

4 *Id.* Next, the ALJ considered a medical source statement from Charlie Kano, MD in March 2019.
 5 *Id.* Dr. Kano first treated Plaintiff in March 2017 for a primary diagnosis of selective
 6 immunoglobulin G deficiency, ADHD, and hearing loss. *Id.* Dr. Kano “indicated a moderate
 7 impairment in acquiring and using information and attending and completing tasks; no
 8 impairment in interacting and relating with others, moving about and manipulating objects, or
 9 caring for herself; but he indicated a marked impairment in health and physical well-being.”. *Id.*
 10 Dr. Kano noted Plaintiff took medication that caused anorexia and insomnia that were slight and
 11 caused a mild degree of impairment in concentration. *Id.*

12 The ALJ also reviewed Psychologist Dr. Faren R. Akins’ opinion. *Id.* at 26-27. Dr. Akins
 13 assessed Plaintiff’s ADHD was Plaintiff’s only severe mental impairment. *Id.* at 26. Dr. Akins
 14 found a notation of schizophrenia in the record and determined some complaints of hallucinations
 15 that could be a basis for a diagnosis, but he did not see an actual diagnosis. *Id.* Dr. Akins noted
 16 there was also a sensory disorder noted in the record, “but he did not feel it was significant to the
 17 claimant’s presentation.” *Id.* Dr. Akins did not think Plaintiff had an actual diagnosis for
 18 dyslexia, as it is fairly normal for young learners to write backwards. *Id.* Dr. Akins considered
 19 listing 112.11 (neurodevelopmental disorders), but Plaintiff did not meet the listing as there were
 20 no marked domains in the B criteria.⁴ *Id.*

21 Dr. Akins opined Plaintiff was mildly limited in understanding, remembering, or applying
 22 information and interacting with others, and moderately limited in concentration, persistence, or
 23 maintaining pace and adapting or managing oneself. *Id.* at 26-27. Dr. Akins “specifically noted
 24 teacher questionnaires to support his position” and noted improvement in functioning with
 25 medication. *Id.* at 27. With regard to the child domains, Dr. Akins opined the claimant had a less

26 ⁴ Although not elaborated upon during the taking of Dr. Akins’ testimony, the reference to
 27 “B criteria” appears related to subsection B of listing 112.11, which requires a finding of certain
 28 impairments with respect to identified areas of mental functioning. *See Z.W. ex. rel. Caldwell v.*
Astrue, No. EDCV 09-0322-CT, 2009 WL 2707451, at *5 & n.3 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2009).

1 than marked limit in acquiring and using information, attending and completing tasks, interacting
2 with others, and caring for self; and had no limitation in moving about and manipulating objects.
3 *Id.*

4 The ALJ concluded, “I have considered all of these reports and I give them some weight.
5 I have also considered the overall medical record in making this decision. I give the most weight
6 to Dr. Akins’ testimony with regard to mental limitations, as he had the opportunity to review the
7 entire record and set forth a persuasive basis for his determination at the hearing.” *Id.*

8 The ALJ next considered the “six functional equivalence domains” regarding limitations
9 caused by Plaintiff’s impairments. *Id.* at 27-33. In terms of attending and completing tasks, the
10 ALJ found Plaintiff “has less than marked limitation in attending and completing tasks.” *Id.* at
11 29. The ALJ determined Plaintiff has issues focusing and maintaining concentration but had done
12 better with medication. *Id.* The ALJ found the teacher questionnaires indicated some
13 inconsistencies with reports in the area of functioning. *Id.* The ALJ expressly characterized the
14 “2017 teacher report” as only indicating a “slight problem when spoken to directly, and [that
15 Plaintiff] had not needed to use her sensory station more than three times in two months.” *Id.*
16 The ALJ concluded the March 2019 report “indicated obvious, serious, and very serious problems
17 in the area of functioning.” *Id.* The ALJ found that these inconsistent reports were not sufficient
18 to overrule Dr. Akins’ opinion that Plaintiff is less than markedly limited in attending and
19 completing tasks. *Id.* The ALJ stated, “[i]n support, I note that [Plaintiff] was progressing well in
20 school, she was able to pay attention and answer questions appropriately at the hearing, and she
21 enjoyed cheer, t-ball, and dance.” *Id.*

22 The ALJ held Plaintiff does not have an impairment or combination of impairments that
23 result in either “marked” limitations in two domains of functioning or “extreme” limitation in one
24 domain of functioning. *Id.* at 33. The ALJ concluded Plaintiff has not been disabled, as defined
25 in the Social Security Act, since February 2, 2017, the date the application was filed. *Id.*

26 **V. LEGAL ISSUE**

27 Plaintiff advances a single issue of claimed error for this Court’s review: that the ALJ
28 failed to properly analyze non-medical opinions and erred in concluding Plaintiff is less than

1 markedly impaired in the domain of attending and completing tasks. (Doc. 27 at 2).

2 VI. DISCUSSION

3 In evaluating child disability cases, the opinions of a child's teachers are "valuable
 4 sources of evidence." *See* Social Security Ruling (SSR) 06-03p, "Considering Opinions & Other
 5 Evidence from Sources Who Are Not 'Acceptable Med. Sources' in Disability Claims;
 6 Considering Decisions on Disability by Other Governmental & Nongovernmental Agencies,"
 7 *available at* 2006 WL 2329939, at *3 (Aug. 9, 2006). As with lay witness testimony, the
 8 educators' opinions are "other sources" that must be considered and the ALJ should explain the
 9 weight provided to them. *Id.* at *6. In considering how much weight to give "other" source
 10 opinion evidence, the ALJ should consider: (1) "how long the source has known and how
 11 frequently the source has seen the individual"; (2) "how consistent the opinion with other
 12 evidence"; (3) "the degree to which the source presents relevant evidence to support an opinion";
 13 (4) "how well the source explains the opinion"; (5) "whether the source has a specialty or are of
 14 expertise related to the individual's impairment(s)"; and (6) "any other factors that tend to support
 15 or refute this opinion." *Id.* at *4. The ALJ cannot disregard lay witness testimony without
 16 providing reasons germane to the witness. *Stout*, 454 F.3d at 1053; *See Bayliss v. Barnhart*, 427
 17 F.3d 1211, 1218 (9th Cir. 2005) ("Germane reasons for discrediting a lay-witness's testimony
 18 include inconsistency with the medical evidence and the fact that the testimony 'generally
 19 repeat[s]' the properly discredited testimony of a claimant.").

20 Plaintiff contends the ALJ failed to consider all of the relevant evidence in her record,
 21 including the pertinent information from her teachers. (Doc. 27 at 9). Plaintiff asserts the ALJ
 22 failed to follow the standards set forth in SSR 06-03p. *Id.* Specifically, Plaintiff contends that
 23 Ms. Zavala and Ms. Phillips were "internally consistent" and "entirely consistent" with one
 24 another. As such, "the ALJ should have explained if and how he determined that, despite the
 25 consistency of limitations" as noted by the two teachers in the domain of attending and
 26 completing tasks, the reports were entitled to "essentially no weight." *Id.* at 10-11. Plaintiff
 27 notes that "Dr. Akins did not dispute that in this domain, [Ms. Zavala and Ms. Phillips'] reports
 28 were not inconsistent, and indeed demonstrated a worsening of the impairment." *Id.* at 10.

1 Plaintiff argues “[b]ecause the ALJ is also silent on that issue, the reviewing court has no guide to
 2 determine how the ALJ reconciled this discrepancy.” *Id.* Additionally, Plaintiff contends the
 3 ALJ failed to consider the length of time each teacher had been involved with the claimant. *Id.* at
 4 11. Plaintiff claims that this error is not harmless because “[h]ad the ALJ found one more domain
 5 to be markedly impaired, a favorable determination would result pursuant to SSR 09-1p.” *Id.*

6 Defendant argues the ALJ considered statements from Plaintiff’s teachers and provided
 7 valid reasons for giving them “some weight.” (Doc. 31at 8-9). Defendant asserts “although each
 8 of Plaintiff’s teachers noted some problems in the functional domain of attending and completing
 9 tasks, most of their assessments either noted no or at most ‘slight’ problems in this area.” *Id.* at 9-
 10 11. Defendant argues the ALJ properly discounted the statements made by Plaintiff’s teachers
 11 because they were inconsistent with one another. *Id.* Defendant similarly contends the ALJ
 12 properly discounted Plaintiff’s teacher’s testimony as they were inconsistent with the overall
 13 record. *Id.* at 11-14. Defendant points to the ALJ’s conclusion that the teacher questionnaires
 14 were not consistent with the testimony from Drs. Kano and Akins and the assessment that
 15 Plaintiff had performed better in school with medication, as well as with Plaintiff’s daily
 16 activities. *Id.* at 14. Defendant asserts “[t]he ALJ’s finding that Plaintiff had marked limitations
 17 in no more than one functional domain was reasonable, supported by medical opinion evidence
 18 and the record as a whole, and should be affirmed.” *Id.* at 15.

19 As set forth above, the ALJ found the teacher reports were inconsistent and were not
 20 sufficient to overrule Dr. Akins’ opinion that Plaintiff is less than markedly limited in attending
 21 and completing tasks. AR. 29. The ALJ found the basis for this inconsistency was that “[t]he
 22 2017 teacher report only indicated only [sic] a slight problem when spoken to directly, and she
 23 had not needed to use her sensory station more than three times in two months,” while the “March
 24 2019 report indicated obvious, serious, and very serious problems in the area of functioning.” *Id.*
 25 Thus, the ALJ compared the reports of Ms. Heath, Plaintiff’s first grade teacher, and Ms. Phillips,
 26 Plaintiff’s second grade teacher.

27 The ALJ did not address the report of Ms. Zavala, Plaintiff’s kindergarten teacher, in that
 28 section of the opinion. An ALJ errs by failing to “explain her reasons for disregarding...lay

1 witness testimony, either individually or in the aggregate.” *Molina v. Astrue*, 674 F.3d 1104,
 2 1114-15 (9th Cir. 2012). This error may be harmless “where the testimony is similar to other
 3 testimony that the ALJ validly discounted, or where the testimony is contradicted by more
 4 reliable medical evidence that the ALJ credited.” *See id.* at 1118-19. Additionally, “an ALJ’s
 5 failure to comment upon lay witness testimony is harmless where ‘the same evidence that the ALJ
 6 referred to in discrediting [the claimant’s] claims also discredits [the lay witness’s] claims.’ *Id.* at
 7 1122 (quoting *Buckner v. Astrue*, 646 F.3d 549, 560 (8th Cir. 2011)). When an ALJ fails to
 8 “consider and comment upon” “uncontradicted lay testimony” that is relevant to the claimant’s
 9 condition, “a reviewing court cannot consider the error harmless unless it can confidently
 10 conclude that no reasonable ALJ, when fully crediting the testimony, could have reached a
 11 different disability determination.” *Stout*, 454 F.3d at 1053, 1056.

12 Here, the backgrounds, observations and statements of the three teachers are varying. Ms.
 13 Zavala had known Plaintiff for seven months when she wrote her report and Ms. Phillips reported
 14 having known Plaintiff for eight months when she wrote her report. *Id.* at 266, 335. In contrast,
 15 Ms. Heath stated she had known Plaintiff only for approximately six weeks (August 16, through
 16 September 28, 2017) when she wrote her report. *Id.* at 650. Thus, Ms. Heath’s rating that
 17 Plaintiff had a slight problem “paying attention when spoken to directly” and no problems in 12
 18 other key activities was based on a minimal period of observation which was orders of magnitude
 19 less than Ms. Zavala and Ms. Phillips’ experience interacting with Plaintiff. *Id.* at 652.

20 Certainly, the ALJ would have found “inconsistencies with reports in the area of
 21 functioning” by comparing the eight months of observations by Ms. Zavala and Phillips to that of
 22 the limited observation by Ms. Heath. *Id.* at 29. Had the ALJ “consider[ed] and comment[ed]
 23 upon” Ms. Zavala’s report, after teaching Plaintiff for seven months, the ALJ would have noted
 24 the report consistent with Ms. Phillips, who had rendered her report after teaching Plaintiff for
 25 eight months. *See Stout*, 454 F.3d at 1053.

26 Ms. Zavala’s report observed Plaintiff had no problem to a slight problem in eight of the
 27 13 key activities for attending and completing tasks. *Id.* at 337. Ms. Zavala found Plaintiff had
 28 an obvious problem in (1) focusing long enough to finish an assigned activity or task, (2) carrying

1 out multi-step instructions, (3) waiting to take turns, and (4) completing work accurately without
2 careless mistakes. *Id.* Ms. Zavala assessed Plaintiff had a serious problem working without
3 distracting self or others. *Id.* Ms. Zavala commented Plaintiff tends to ask for help as soon as she
4 is asked to work independently and that, once she is given directions, she can work
5 independently. *Id.* Ms. Zavala also noted Plaintiff often talks to herself or others and becomes a
6 distraction unless her attention is directed. *Id.*

7 In comparison, Ms. Phillips reported Plaintiff had no problem to a slight problem in five
8 of the 13 key activities for attending and completing tasks. *Id.* at 268. Ms. Phillips found
9 Plaintiff had an obvious problem in (1) paying attention when spoken to directly, (2) changing
10 from one activity to another without being disruptive, and (3) working at a reasonable
11 pace/finishing on time. *Id.* In all three categories, Ms. Phillips provided a worse rating in
12 comparison to Ms. Zavala. *Id.* at 268, 337. Ms. Phillips found Plaintiff had a serious problem:
13 (1) focusing long enough to finish an assigned activity or task, (2) refocusing to task when
14 necessary, (3) organizing own things or school materials, and (4) completing work accurately
15 without careless mistakes. *Id.* at 268. These assessments constitute a more adverse rating in
16 comparison to Ms. Zavala. *Id.* at 268, 337. Both teachers identified Plaintiff had problems with
17 focusing long enough to finish an assigned activity or tasks and completing work accurately
18 without careless mistake. *Id.* Ms. Phillips assessed Plaintiff had a “very serious problem”
19 working without distracting self or others. *Id.* at 268. Ms. Phillips provided a more adverse
20 rating in comparison to Ms. Zavala, and both teachers agreed Plaintiff functioned more
21 deficiently in this key activity than any of the other 12 activities making up the
22 attending/completing tasks domain. *Id.* at 268, 337. Separately, Ms. Phillips commented Plaintiff
23 frequently could not attend to tasks even while on medication and she was all over the room
24 bothering others despite redirection. *Id.* at 268.

25 In sum, Ms. Zavala and Phillip’s reports, both given after each had interacted with
26 Plaintiff for at least seven months, were consistent with one another in identifying Plaintiff’s
27 limitations in attending and completing tasks. The ALJ’s reliance on Ms. Heath’s limited report
28 to show there were inconsistencies in the teacher questionnaires without commenting on the

1 internal consistencies of the reports from two sources who had a significantly longer basis for
2 observing and commenting on Plaintiff's functionality constitutes error. *See Stout*, 454 F.3d at
3 1053; *see also Ghanim v. Colvin*, 763 F.3d 1154, 1164 (9ths Cir. 2014) (finding error where ALJ
4 "improperly cherry-picked" evidence without broader consideration of overall context).

5 In concluding Plaintiff had less than a marked limitation in the attending/completing tasks
6 domain, the ALJ discounted the teacher questionnaires because, the ALJ asserted, they were
7 inconsistent and, thus, insufficient to overrule Dr. Akins' opinion, which the ALJ wholly credited.
8 AR. 29. But the ALJ did not cite Ms. Zavala's report in his passing reference to the "teacher
9 questionnaires" and offered no rationale either for ignoring her opinion or discounting Ms.
10 Phillips' report. *See Noa v. Berryhill*, No. 17-cv-05147-MEJ, 2018 WL 1696819, at *7-8 (N.D.
11 Cal. Apr. 6, 2018) (finding error where the ALJ failed to identify what portions of the lay witness
12 testimony was inconsistent with the medical record); *Eddy v. Colvin*, No. 14-cv-01418-JE, 2016
13 WL 11383833 at *6 (D. Or. Sept. 1, 2016) ("the Ninth Circuit has held that it is error for an ALJ
14 to reject lay witness testimony simply because it is not corroborated by the medical record").
15 Based on his failure to acknowledge Ms. Zavala's report or offer any substantive comment
16 regarding the cited inconsistencies, the Court can only speculate as to the inconsistencies the ALJ
17 found, or the statements—or portions thereof—that the ALJ rejected. *Noa*, 2018 WL 1696819, at
18 *7-8; *Brown-Hunter v. Colvin*, 806 F.3d 487, 495 (9th Cir. 2015) (the court cannot "speculate as
19 to the grounds for the ALJ's conclusions").

20 Consequently, the Court finds that the ALJ erred in failing to provide germane reasons for
21 discounting Ms. Zavala and Phillips' report. The error was not harmless. In particular, the Court
22 cannot "confidently conclude" that no ALJ could reach a different disability determination had he
23 fully credited the teacher's internally consistent reports. *See Stout*, 454 F.3d at 1053, 1056.
24 *Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1117. Ms. Zavala and Phillips are teachers who worked closely with Plaintiff
25 on an almost daily basis for over seven months and during different school years. The reports are
26 substantially similar in assessing problems in the domain of attending and completing tasks.
27 Given that the ALJ had already found Plaintiff had a marked limitation in the domain of health
28 and physical well-being and that the teachers' assessments plausibly suggest that Plaintiff may

1 also have marked limitation in the domain of attending and completing tasks, it conceivably is a
2 close question as to whether marked limitations exist in two domains. As such, it was incumbent
3 upon the ALJ to clearly articulate germane reasons for discounting Ms. Zavala and Phillips'
4 reports.

5 **VII. REMAND**

6 The decision whether to remand a matter pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g)
7 or to order immediate payment of benefits is within the discretion of the district court. *Harman v.*
8 *Apfel*, 211 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2000). Except in rare instances, when a court reverses an
9 administrative agency determination, the proper course is to remand to the agency for additional
10 investigation or explanation. *Moisa v. Barnhart*, 367 F.3d 882, 886 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing *INS v.*
11 *Ventura*, 537 U.S. 12, 16 (2002)). Generally, an award of benefits is directed when:

12 (1) the ALJ has failed to provide legally sufficient reasons for rejecting such evidence, (2)
13 there are no outstanding issues that must be resolved before a determination of disability
14 can be made, and (3) it is clear from the record that the ALJ would be required to find the
claimant disabled were such evidence credited.

15
16 *Smolen v. Chater*, 80 F.3d 1273, 1292 (9th Cir. 1996). In addition, an award of benefits is
17 directed where no useful purpose would be served by further administrative proceedings, or
18 where the record is fully developed. *Varney v. Sec'y of Health & Human Serv.*, 859 F.2d 1396,
19 1399 (9th Cir. 1998).

20 Here, the ALJ's decision was not supported by substantial evidence and constituted legal
21 error that was not harmless by failing to properly consider and provide germane reasons for
22 discounting the opinions of Plaintiff's teachers, and the Court finds it appropriate to remand the
23 case for proper consideration of these opinions for the reasons discussed above. Because this
24 error may be remediable, further administrative proceedings are warranted.

25 ///

26 ///

27

28

VIII. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that the ALJ's decision is not supported by substantial evidence. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 27) is GRANTED;
2. Defendant's cross-motion for summary judgment (Doc. 31) is DENIED;
3. The ALJ's decision is VACATED, and this matter is REMANDED to the ALJ for further proceedings consistent with this order; and
4. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to enter judgment in favor of Megan Goodeill on behalf of her minor daughter A.M.F. and against Defendant Kilolo Kijakazi, Acting Commissioner of Social Security.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 29, 2023

Chris D. Brown
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE